

Message

From: Peak, Tracy [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=D91E8031A31646439C7A33829C4EC926-DEGERING, TRACY]
Sent: 5/23/2017 9:18:38 PM
To: Bujak, Charissa [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=b7145378c12f43df9e2bf70e7d951196-Bujak, Char]
Subject: FW: US 95 Thorn Creek to Moscow DEIS

More history (note Nicholle's response...):

From: Somers, Elaine
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2013 2:00 PM
To: Fromm, Carla <Fromm.Carla@epa.gov>; Degering, Tracy <DeGering.Tracy@epa.gov>
Subject: Fw: US 95 Thorn Creek to Moscow DEIS

Carla, Tracy,
FYI, from the Corps. Wetlands are not the driver in this project. The main issues are avoiding the Palouse prairie remnants (avoiding alignment E-2, also vigorously requested by IDFG), particularly Paradise Ridge, both in terms of direct and indirect effects, and the need to provide wildlife crossings/permeability in the highway. I would still appreciate your review of the wetland/aquatic issues, and some Idaho-based support for the other issues, as John was helpful in these ways. I know we are all swamped, so I appreciate any attention you may be able to give to this project. Let me know if you would like me to give you a call to discuss or provide a brief background.
Thanks so much,
Elaine

----- Forwarded by Elaine Somers/R10/USEPA/US on 02/13/2013 12:50 PM -----

From: "Braspennickx, Nicholle M NWW" <Nicholle.M.Braspenn@usace.army.mil>
To: Elaine Somers/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Shawn Smith <Shawn.Smith@itd.idaho.gov>
Date: 02/13/2013 12:38 PM
Subject: RE: US 95 Thorn Creek to Moscow DEIS (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE

Hello Elaine,

Yes I am working on the DEIS...

And I looked for the points of contact in the document - but you are correct - they are not there. So I am cc:ing Shawn Smith at ITD - he is the Environmental Planner on project now.

The Corps is of the opinion that any alternative (but for no action) meets purpose and need. Wetland and stream channel impacts are not so much a driver for alternative selection.. w/ justifications, the Corps can see reasons to permit any of the three action alternatives. The waters of the U.S., including wetlands, are heavily impacted by surrounding agricultural land use... All action alternatives impact the same sort of lower ranking aquatic resource.

Hope this helps,

Nicholle B.
208-345-2287

-----Original Message-----

From: Somers.Elaine@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Somers.Elaine@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 12, 2013 5:43 PM
To: Braspenickx, Nicholle M NWW
Subject: US 95 Thorn Creek to Moscow DEIS

Hello, Nicholle!

It's been too long since! Are you, by chance, involved with the review of the US 95 Thorn Ck to Moscow DEIS? If so, I would welcome a chance to hear your thoughts about it. Also, do you know who the other agency contacts are for this project now? for IDFG? for USFWS? Hope we can talk soon.

Many thanks,
Elaine

Elaine Somers
Environmental Review and Sediment Management Unit
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10
1200-6th Ave., Suite 900, ETPA-088
Seattle, WA 98101
phone: (206) 553-2966
fax: (206) 553-6984
email: somers.elaine@epa.gov

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE